Theorizing Transnational Japanese Film and Media

Marcos P. Centeno-Martín
Norimasa Morita

Introduction

The present publication is the result of a collaborative project originally entitled 'Japanese Transnational Cinema,' whose aim was bringing together well-established scholars as well as young researchers working on innovative approaches towards Japanese cinema. The aim of this project is proposing new analytical methodologies and theoretical frameworks concerning the transnational complexities of film and media culture related to Japan and challenging the old 'national' paradigm by highlighting the limitations of studying film and media as a phenomenon confined to its national borders.

The project was led in partnership between Birkbeck College, University of London and Waseda University and also in collaboration among colleagues from other British and Japanese universities. Some outcomes of our research were published in a special issue of *Arts*, an international open-access peer-reviewed journal edited by Marcos P. Centeno-Martín and Norimasa Morita in 2019 and presented in the international meetings, a two-day seminar held at Birkbeck in May 2019 whose second part took place few months later as a two-day symposium at Waseda, Tokyo, in July 2019. This European-Japanese exchange was possible thanks to the generous financial support from Waseda University, MEXT-Top Global University Project, Daiwa Anglo-Japanese Foundation, Great Britain Sasakawa Foundation, Birkbeck School of Arts,

and Nagoya University which allowed Japanese scholars to attend the event in London and UK-based scholars to be present in Tokyo.

Theorising Japanese Cinema as a 'National Cinema'

Being one of the oldest and most prolific film industries in the world, second only to Hollywood until the 1960s, Japanese Cinema has become a fruitful field of study which has inspired scholars across the world since the last decades of the 20th century. Influential works were written in the late 1970s (Bordwell and Thomson 1976; Burch 1979) assessing seriously the singularities of Japanese films and how Japanese film makers managed to create their own narratives and stylistic codes. They inspired subsequent studies focusing on how Japanese films challenged the modes of representation which had been developed in the West. During the following years, more scholars joined this 'turn to the Orient' and explored the traits of the Japanese aesthetic and philosophical tradition in Japanese cinema. They embarked on these projects seeking to demonstrate how Japanese cinema ignored Western film-making conventions, codes, and techniques as well as film and narrative forms and styles, while it created its own cultural referents, which for Burch, dated back to the Heian period. These studies tried to demonstrate more or less successfully how Japanese film makers developed a mode of representation not paralleling with Hollywood's, if not so much as an act of opposition to it. According to them, Japanese film makers were indifferent to Hollywood traditions. Burch tried to justify this hypothesis with two arguments. First, except the period of the postwar occupation, Japan was never been colonized or placed in quasi-colonial conditions unlike other Asian countries and the Japanese film industry, too, maintained its independence. Secondly, Japan developed its own film studios and trained its own professionals, directors, cameramen, scriptwriters, etc. Thus, the uniqueness of Japanese cinema may have been the result of the technical and economic independence from foreign influences.

The critical contributions such as Burch's were not small, in making us to realise that there existed a cinema tradition that did not follow American and European film makers and emulate their films. They were crucially important for the appreciation of the values of early masters like

Ozu Yasujirō. The pervading calmness, tranquility, laconism, narrative and formal harmony and consistency as well as his elliptic styles in Ozu's films, were generally traced back to the Zen Buddhist tradition with which he must have had been familiar. The Japanese cultural context may provide epistemological keys to appreciate, for example, Ozu's contemplative style and his privileging of the present-tense narrating over the flashback, because such narrative and formal characteristics are associated with the sensitivity to the ephemerality and transience of things in *mono no aware* (pathos of things). Additionally, Ozu's reflexion on lifecycles – being born, growing up, getting married, aging and dying – was interpreted as if it were connected to the Buddhist teaching of the three marks of existence (*sanbōin*): 'impermanence' (*mujō*), 'suffering' (*ku*) and "emptiness or absence of self-nature" (*kū*). The ubiquitous presence of mysterious empty shots, whose narrative function has intrigued many scholars (Burch; Bordwell 1994), may not have been merely accidental, if he had been inspired by the aesthetics of *yohaku no bi* (beauty of emptiness) in the ink painting (*suibokuga*). Even Ozu's artisanal conception of cinema throughout which he made the same kind of film again and again by using similar motifs, themes, rhetoric, actors and characters (Centeno 2017: 141-144), may have developed from the practices of certain traditional art forms such as *Sadō* (tea ceremony) *Shodō* (calligraphy) and *Budō* (martial art).

The National Cinema approach has frequently been applied in the exploration of the singularities of the films of Kurosawa Akira as well, who like Ozu, is often regarded as the key figure in the discussion on the national paradigm of Japanese cinema. Kurosawa's *Rashōmon* (1951), which triggered the postwar reappraisal of Japanese films in European film festivals, is not only based on a Akutagawa Ryūnosuke's short story "In a Grove" (Yabu no Naka, 1922),[1] but also contains elements echoing Nō theatre, such as the inclusion of a spirit of a dead person, the Mediaeval settings, and the presence of a Buddhist monk as *waki* (the main supporting character). The theatrical reference in Kurosawa does not stop here, as one can find many interrelations between his films and *Kabuki* dramas like the one in *Seven Samurai*

[1] Kurosawa's *Rashōmon* also contains elements from Akutagawa's homonymous short story 'Rashōmon' (1915).

(Shichinin no Samurai, 1954) where the leading character Shimada Kambei is the embodiment of *tachiyaku* (male protagonist) and his assistant Okamoto Katsushirō *nimaime* (good-looking young man) (Satō 1987: 15-30).

However, these approaches from "national" characteristics of films had various structural limitations, because they normally took essentialist views in regarding Japanese cinema as something unique and neglecting the complexity of transnational influences that interacted at the local level. The same examples provided before can be used to illustrate this problem. Even films of Ozu, 'the most Japanese of the Japanese filmmakers' (Richie 1974), who truly developed singular styles, cannot be fully explained without taking into account Hollywood influences in the earlier stages of his career, which helped him modersnise Japanese cinema. His decision to dispense with the *benshi* (narrator) on the stage of a movie theatre and replacing him by intertitles is an example of this American influence. Similarly, Kurosawa's works are generally considered as an epitome of Japanese National Cinema but it is also well known that in creating them, he heavily relied on the stories of moral and philosophical conflicts such as William Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and *King Lear*, Leo Tolstoy's *Death of Ivan Ilyich*, and Maxim Gorky's *The Lower Depth*.

Limitations of the "National" Paradigm

Film critics and historians started in the 1980s to raise their voice against this national cinematic paradigm and urge to expand the study of Japanese cinema beyond the limits of its national borders. This approach entailed dismantling the previous theoretical framework and breaking down the notion of Japanese Cinema as an isolated and self-referential artifact. Works like Yamamoto Kikuo's *The Influence of Foreign Films on Japanese Films* (1983) challenged the previous understanding that Japanese cinema was unique because it developed in isolation from the rest of the world and also opened up ways to liberate the study of Japanese film culture from earlier essentialist views.

At the end of the decade, Andrew Higson (1989) tried to deconstruct more systematically the general paradigm of National Cinema. Demonstrating that its theoretical framework is only too unstable, Higson poses a simple but penetrating question: what are we talking about when we talk about national

cinema? Engagement in this discussion allows him to note that there is no universally applicable notion of 'national cinema' and on the contrary this concept is used in a large variety of ways. According to him, 'national cinema' was first used as an economic term referring to all the films produced within a nation. In other words, national cinema was established in correspondence with the emergence and development of the 'domestic film industry.' This view that was mainly concerned with where and by whom films were made became obsolete in the 1980s when the number of international co-productions dramatically increased.

The second 'consumption-based' view of this term was concerned with what films audiences watched within a domestic market. However, it was exposed to a problem, when it was found that a significant proportion of the films that audiences watched in the domestic market was foreign, particularly Hollywood, ones. Another problem is some films are consumed mainly outside the nation where they were produced due to either local censorship imposed by the authoritarian regime or to international success and popularity. An example is Luis Buñuel's *Viridiana* (1961), a masterpiece of Spanish cinema which won the *Palme d'Or* at the Cannes Film Festival, while it was banned in Spain by the Franco regime. Higson (1898: 39) refers as examples to the films made by the Sixth Generation film makers in China which were chiefly watched abroad. They presented social criticism and discontent dodging the state censorship via international funding, distribution and exhibition. More recently, Jia Zhangke, a Chinese Sixth Generation film maker, made success at international film festivals with his *Still Life* (Sānxiá hǎorén, 2006) and *Platform* (Zhàntái, 2000) which were funded, if partially, by Office Kitano. The consumption-based views of national cinema paradoxically disclose that films transcend the national context and become part of a shared global culture. This is particularly relevant for examining the global circulation of Japanese films from the 1990s, such as *J-Horror* (Stringer 1989, McRoy 2005), films included in the 'Asia Extreme' catalogue created by Tartan Distribution Company (Shin 2009), movies like *Battle Royal* (Bowyer 2000), and Studio Ghibli' animation films (Denison 2001) and also the rise of a global fan communities or transnational audiences with shared interests (Dew 2007; Napier 2009). These examples are essential to understand the relevance of films for the so-called Japanese 'soft power' (McGray 2002; Iwabuchi 2002).

The third view of national cinema is based on a sort of 'text-based approach,' through which narratives and visual forms are closely examined in order to extract shared national characteristics in styles, narrative tropes, systems of representation and aesthetics. This analytical approach had specific relevance in the definitions of Japanese 'national cinema' from the 1970s (Bordwell and Thomson 1976; Burch 1979). The inherent problem in this perspective is, however, that such shared national characteristics can easily be transformed or intentionally undermined by film makers. This is the case with the experimental and *avant-garde* authors like Oshima Nagisa whose deconstruction of the *Jidai-geki* (period drama) genre and the heteronormative sexuality of the samurai class in *Taboo* (Gohatto, 1999) is illustrative. In another instance, the text-based approach may reveal how film makers reproduce codes of representation and cultural referents beyond the national boundaries. Its example is the adoption of the codes of American youth culture in the 1950s embedded in movie icons such as Marlon Brando and James Dean into the *Taiyōzoku* films starring Ishihara Yūjirō (Centeno Martín 2016; Raine 2000); the reproduction of the iconography of the American West in the *Wataridori* series starring Kobayashi Akira (Kitamura 2012) or more recently in Takashi Miike's *Sukiyaki Western Django* (2007) and Lee Sang-il's *The Unforgiven* (Yurusarezaru Mono, 2013) (Exley 2018).

The text-based film criticism was the (self)reflexive approach developed by critics and film makers from the 1950s such as André Bazin, Alexandre Astruc and François Truffaut who presented new theoretical frameworks centering on formal analysis and sought to identify 'quality cinema.' This provided film critics and historians with theoretical ammunition for defining various forms of New Cinema as 'National Cinema' that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s as alternatives to Hollywood's 'Institutional Mode of Representation' (IMR) according to the term coined by Burch (1969).[2] This was a criticism-led view that, as Higson noted, tended to posit 'world cinema' as the 'other' of Hollywood, and grounded itself on a traditional distinction between 'highbrow' and 'lowbrow' cultures. According to this view, national cinema only refers to those films associated with high culture, but not those which are designed to satisfy the tastes of the popular audience. Interestingly, this analytical

[2] Previously described by Bazin as the "Myth of total cinema" (1967)

approach appeared simultaneously with the postwar 'discovery' in the West of Japanese films, which Westerners found as a possible alternative to Hollywood movies. However, it came with an extra complication, because, as noted above, even classical film makers such as Ozu Yasujirō and Mizoguchi Kenji belonged to a group of modernisers in prewar Japan who adopted IMR codes.

These critical shortcomings and inconsistencies mostly derived from the fact that the paradigm of 'Japanese national cinema' was to a great extent postulated outside Japan. After the 'discovery' of Japanese cinema in the 1950s, European and American scholars elaborated ideas of Japanese national cinema merely from the films that were available in the West. This means that they constructed such a large concept by watching a fraction of the entire body of Japanese films. All the films that succeeded at important European film festivals and/or won Academy Awards were *Jidaigeki* (period dramas) made by Kurosawa, Mizoguchi, Yoshimura Kōzaburō, Takizawa Eisuke, Imai Tadashi and Inagaki Hiroshi. It was more than anything else the exoticism projected on screen that fascinated Western audiences and created '*kimono* craze' (Weinrichter, 2002). Japanese film studios and distributors deliberately sent *Jidaigeki* to European festivals, since they had discovered that a recipe for success abroad was to capture the imagination of Western audiences by screening images of a country stuck in its legendary past and traditions (Centeno Martín 2018). However, the popularity of the works shown in the West hardly corresponded with the general preferences of Japanese audiences: in the early 1950s, the production of *Gendaigeki* (contemporary dramas) was twice as big as *Jidaigeki,* and at the end of the decade, the number of the former was almost four times larger than the latter (VV.AA. 1963, p.36; Centeno Martín 2018: 8). This evidently shows how the perception and reception of Japanese cinema abroad was grounded on the viewing experiences that were markedly different from those at the home market — in fact, Japanese screens at the time were filled with the new *Seishun Eiga* (youth cinema) reflecting various forms of American popular and youth culture. Nevertheless, this transnational intertextuality was overlooked by distant observers. The national paradigm tended to be built only by assembling the stylistic traits that were exotic for and unfamiliar to the Western norm and this made its theoretical framework greatly unreliable and vulnerable.

Local Traditions in Transnational Cinema

Higson returned to his critique of national cinema two decades later (Higson 2000) by reflecting on the cerebrated idea of 'imagined community.' A nation is a socially constructed community, imagined by the dominant group of people living in it and believing that their community is homogeneous ethnically and culturally. Films as well as the media have traditionally been playing the role of a vehicle for spreading this kind of the notion of nationhood. Social diversity, and ethnic, regional, linguistic, and cultural virieties within the same community were rarely represented on screen till recently, in spite that societies are in reality a diverse space where people with different ethnic backgrounds live, different languages are spoken, and different faiths are practiced. This is the problem with national cinema, particularly Japanese national cinema. In Japan where the myth of racial and cultural homogeneity is deeply rooted, it is remarkably easy to imagine a national cinema which consisted of the films which share the same kind of narrative and thematic distinctiveness, aesthetic sensibility, social and political values, and artistic and stylistic uniqueness.

In the age of globalization in which great many people move around the globe and the volume of culture and information travel fast and wide, the notions of national identity, national homogeneity and national cinema no longer hold. Higson, however, makes an interesting point that new mass migrations or visible diasporas in the time of globalization brought about a new form of imagined society, that is, a vision of far-away homeland shared by immigrants who are living in the tension between unity and disunity and also home and homelessness (Higson 2000: 65). The study of identities, homogeneity and uniqueness beyond national borders become an increasingly relevant for film studies and is crucial in redefining the unstable category of national film and media in the 21st century. Diaspora, multiculturalism and cultural hybridity are phenomena of our time that little by little find their place on screen. Moreover, cinematic rebels or mavericks occasionally appeared in any nation and challenged the notion of national cinema. It is, therefore, a site of crisis, resistance and negotiation.

Transnational approaches in film studies call into question national paradigms, but at the same time, this does not mean that it is a complete

analytical method that can explain everything and has universal applicability. This introduction does not attempt to suggest that the transnational approach can supplant arguments for national cinema. In fact, while national elements may seem irrelevant in transnational cinema, investigation into them may still be meaningful. Let's take for example Japanese horror films or so-called *J-Horror* in the late 1990s and the early 2000s. This genre is a fascinating case and has recently attracted a lot of scholary attention (Stringer, McRoy, Shin). It began with Hideo Nakata's *Ring* (Ringu, 1998), the film adaptation of Suzuki Kōji's novel with the same title, which had been published by Kodakawa Shoten in 1991.[3] *Ring* was followed in the subsequent years by a spate of films and subcultural products that integrated the transmedia and transnational qualities like Nakata's trendsetting film. He directed one year later a sequel, *Ring 2* (Ringu 2, 1999), and the following year Norio Tsuruta made *Ring 0: Birthday* (Ringu Zero: Bāsudei, 2000), a prequel to *Ring* which was based on a short story, 'Lemon Heart' by Suzuki and scripted by the screenwriter of the first *Ring*, Takahashi Hiroshi. *Ring* was then turned by Nagai Kōichirō into a series of *manga* loosely based on Nakata's film and Suzuki's novels. The popularity of this franchise expanded beyond Japan and *J-horror* became a sort of transnational genre. A South Korean version, *The Ring Virus* (Kim Dong-bin, 1999) was an adaptation of Suzuki's *Ringu*, including scenes inspired by Nakata's *Ring*. American companies began the production of its own remakes from 2002, starting with Gore Verbinski's *The Ring* which was released the year before the publication of the English translation of Suzuki's novel in 2003. Then, Nakata travelled to the US to make another *Ring 2* (2005), which is a sequel of the American version rather than a remake of his own Japanese version of *Ring 2*. By the early 2000s, *J-horror* became a global cultural phenomenon prompted by films coming from Japan and the US. Watler Salles made *Dark Water* (2005), a remake of the homonymous film directed by Nakata in 2002. In 2006, Jim Sonzero made *Pulse,* a remake of *Kairo* (Pulse, 2001), which was directed by another Japanese horror

[3] The novel had already been adapted in television series *Ringu: Kanzenban* (1996) when the Kodakawa produced Nakata's film and also *Spiral* (Rasen, George Iida, 1998), an adaptation from the second Suzuki's novel, *Rasen* published in 1995. While *Rasen* had a poor reception at the box office, *Ring* became a hugely successful film.

maestro, Kurosawa Kiyoshi. Simultaneously, Shimizu Takashi, who made *Ju-On* and *Ju-On 2* both released in 2003 in Japan, made his own remakes of these films in Hollywood as *The Grudge* (2004) and *The Grudge 2* (2006) respectively.

Nakata's films and *J-horror* were integrated into global media flows and characterized by transnational synergies, because of which they could migrate and be globally consumed, adapted and transformed. In this process, Stringer also explores the role of Hollywood as a global media franchise and demonstrates how Hollywood continues to do what it has always done, that is, to absorb a local culture and sell it to the rest of the world including the country where it originally comes from. (Stringer 2007: 301)

Ring and *J-Horror* are truly transnational cinema in this sense but assessing them under national parameters may illuminate their national, rather than, transnational qualities. While most of films in this genre tell ghost stories, their settings are in the postmodern society. Ghosts travel through postmodern technologies and electronic devices such as videotapes in the *Ring* or computers in *Pulse,* but these supernatural creatures are traditional *onryō* (vengeful spirit) found in *Kaidan* cinema (films on the 'supernatural'), one of the Japanese national genres. *Onryō* is a trope developed from Japanese folk stories, religious sermons, Kabuki plays and the Nō theatre, whose ghostly tales frequently contain Buddhist moral teachings. One of the earliest *Kaidan* films were probably *The Peony Lantern* (Botan Dōrō), a series of seven films, released between 1911 and 1937 (all of them have been lost). These are based on the story created by a storyteller called Sanyūtei Enchō, who borrowed it partly from a 17th century ghost story, partly from a local legend, and partly from what he heard from other people. Another earliest *Kaidan* film was *Yotsuya Ghost Story* (Yotsuya Kaidan), which was based on a 1825 *Kabuki* play by Tsuruya Nanboku IV and it went on to be adapted into a film over 30 times since 1912. However, some of the most prominent *Kaidan* films were made by a group of postwar humanists in the sixties, such as Kobayashi Masaki's *Kwaidan* (1964), assembling four folktales collected by Lafcadio Hearn, and Shindō Kaneto's *Onibaba* (1964). Shindō features *Shura* (spirit of a warrior) and masks of a demon which are taken from Nō plays and in this way does not conceal the links between *Onibaba* and the traditional Japanese theatre.

Proposal for a 'Trans/national' Methodology

The texts gathered in this volume in one way or another bring a fresh view to the transnational aspects of Japanese and other cinema that have been missed within the national parameters of film studies and criticism. They challenge the 'national' paradigm of Japanese film which mainly consists of three axioms: first, Japanese cinema is reproducing the essential features of its cultural tradition, second, it is closely associated with a culture that has remained unchanged throughout its history and third, Japanese film took its unique shape being isolated from the rest of the world.

The following chapters show how analyses of the transnational traits of Japanese films should be able to overcome the feelings of estrangement and bewilderment experienced by early distant observers and critics, as well the essentialist view in which Japanese cinema is considered as being utterly unique and original. Many of them also question in their own way Orientalist positions of film critics and historians who have been neglecting the interactions between the local and the global. More recently scholars have opened up avenues for studying Japan beyond Japan. This must be a key to explore more accurately complex issues such as: first, the role of Japanese films in the global cultural flows; second, the world representation of Japan and Japan's representation of the world; third, the way in which foreign codes of representation have been adapted in Japan and how Japanese patterns have been accepted in the world. Many chapters in this anthology especially touch upon the third issue and demonstrate that transnational influences and Japanese singularities are not mutually exclusive. As Hjort (2010) notes elsewhere, while a wide range of issues related to the national model remain pertinent today, in other respects the national cinema approach has already become obsolete or irrevant. Hjort provides a useful catalogue of transnational practices, which she defines as "cinematic transnationalism,' where the national makes sense only in relation to the transnational.

However, the transnational approach that we propose here is not concerned with the definition or classification of transnational practices that may occur at national, international or global level, but rather analytical methods of interrogating the 'trans/national' interactions between the local and the global. These interactions may happen beyond the Japanese national boundaries, but

also inside Japan. Therefore, this approach may entail the exploration of issues concerning more than one culture, that is transculturality and multiculturalism in terms of representation. It may also involve studies about international co-productions and works consumed in international markets (e.g. the markets of countries and areas with ethnic, linguistic or cultural affinity, which Hjort calls as 'affinitive transnatinalism') or global markets, which she calls as 'globalising transnationalism' (Hjort, 2010). Moreover, it may include analyses on transnational migration of iconographies, narrative and visual styles, or other film making practices, creating a 'transcultural mimesis' (Nornes 20214: 115) or even a 'translocal imagination' (Miyao 2019: 115),[4] all of which try to prove the existence of a shared visual culture in the (post)modern world.

Bibliography

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities*. London and New York: Verso.

Bazin, Andre. 1967. "The Myth of Total Cinema". *What is Cinema*, Vol. 2, translated by Hugh Gray. Berkeley: University of California Press: 23-27.

Bordwell, David, and Thomson , Kristin. 1976. "Space and Narrative in the Films of Ozu". *Screen*, 17: 41-73.

Bordwell, David. 1994. *Ozu and the Poetics of Cinema*. London: British Film Institute.

Bowyer, Justin. 2004. "Batoru Rowaiaru Battle Royale". In *The Cinema of Japan & Korea*. London: Wallflower: 225-232.

Burch, Noël. 1979. *To the Distant Observer: Form and Meaning in the Japanese Cinema*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____. 1969. *Praxis du cinema*. Paris: Gallimard, 1969.

Centeno Martín, Marcos and Morita, Nori, eds. 2019. Special Issue "Japanese Transnational Cinema". *Arts*. <http://www.mdpi.com/journal/arts/special_issues/Japanese_Transnational_Cinema> (accessed 02.03.2020)

Centeno Martín, Marcos. 2018a. "The Misleading Discovery of Japanese 'National Cinema'". In Special Issue "Japanese Transnational Cinema". *Arts*, 7(4), 87, edited by Marcos Centeno Martín and Nori Morita. <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0752/7/4/87 (accessed 02.03.2020)>

_____. 2018b. "Method Directors. Susumu Hani and Yasujirō Ozu: a Comparative Approach across Paradigms". In *Yasujirō Ozu and the Aesthetics of his Time*, edited

[4] 'Translocal imagination' is simultaneously universal and local imagination where the concept of 'nation' as such is not relevant any more. Miyao takes the concept from Appadurai (1996)

by Andreas Becker, 125-152. Frankfurt and Darmstadt: Büchner-Verlag.

_____. 2016. "Transcultural Corporeity in *Taiyōzoku* Youth Cinema: Some Notes on the Contradictions of Japaneseness in the Economic Miracle". In *Körperinszenierungen im japanischen Film/Presentation of Bodies in Japanese Films*, edited by Andreas Becker and Kayo Adachi-Rabe, 143-160. Frankfurt and Darmstadt: Büchner-Verlag.

Denison, Rayna. 2001. "The Global Markets for Anime: Miyazaki Hayao's *Spirited Away* (2001)". In *Japanese Cinema: Texts and Contexts*, edited by Alastair Phillips and Julian Stringer, 308-321. London [etc.]: Routledge.

Dew, Oliver. 2007. "'Asia Extreme': Japanese cinema and British hype". *New Cinemas: Journal of Contemporary Film*, 5(1): 53-73.

Exley, Charles. 2018. "No land's man: on remaking the last western in Japan and the politics of revision". *Journal of Japanese and Korean Cinema*, 10(2): 147-162.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on The Organization Experience*. London: Harper and Row.

Higson, Andrew. 1989. "The Concept of National Cinema". *Screen*, 30: 36-46.

_____. 2000. "The Limiting Imagination of National Cinema". In *Cinema and Nation*, edited by Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie, 63-74. London and New York: Routledge.

Hjort, Mette. 2010. "On the Plurality of Cinematic Transnationalism". In *World Cinemas, Transnational Perspectives*, edited by Kathleen Newman and Natasa Durovicova, 12-33. New York: Routledge.

Iwabuchi, Kōichi. 2002. "Taking 'Japanization' Seriously: Cultural Globalization Reconsidered". In *Recentering Globalization: Popular Culture and Japanese Transnationalism*, 23-50. Durham: Duke University Press.

Kitamura, Hiroshi. 2012. "Shoot-Out in Hokkaido: the 'Wanderer' (Wataridori) Series and the Politics of Transnationality". In *Transnational Asian Identities in Pan-Pacific Cinemas: the Reel Asian Exchange*, edited by Philippa Gates and Lisa Funnell, 31-45. New York: Routledge.

McRoy, Jay. 2008. *Nightmare Japan: contemporary Japanese horror cinema*, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

McGray, Douglas. 2002. "Japan's Gross National Cool". *Foreign Policy,* May/June, Issue 130: 44-55.

Miyao, Daisuke. 2019. "How can we talk about 'transnational' when we talk about Japanese cinema?" *Journal of Japanese and Korean Cinema*, 11(2): 109-116.

Napier, Susan. 2009. "Differing Destinations: Cultural Identification, Orientalism, and 'Soft Power' in Twenty-First-Century Anime Fandom". In *From Impressionism to Anime: Japan as Fantasy and Fan Cult in the Mind of the West*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Raine, Michael John. 2000. "Ishihara Yūjirō: Youth, Celebrity, and the Male Body in Late-1950s Japan". In *World and Image in Japanese Cinema*, edited by Dennis Washburn

and Carole Cavanaugh, 202-25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Raine, Michael. 2014. “Adaptation as ‘Transcultural Mimesis’ in Japanese Cinema”. In *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Cinema*, edited by Daisuke Miyao, 101-123. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Richie, Donald. 1974. *Ozu: His Life and Films*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Satō, Tadao. 1987. “The Two Leading Men in Japanese Film”. In *Currents in Japanese Cinema*, 15-30. Translated by Gregory Barret. New York: Kodansha International.
Shin, Chi-Yun. 2009. “The Art of Branding: Tartan ‘Asia Extreme’ Films”. In *Horror to the Extreme: Changing Boundaries in Asian Cinema*, edited by Jinhee Choi and Mitsuyo Wada Marciano, 85-99. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
Stringer, Julian. 2007. “The Original and the Copy: Nakata Hideo’s Ring (1989)”. In *Japanese Cinema: Texts and Contexts*, edited by Alastair Phillips and Julian Stringer, 296-307. London [etc].: Routledge.
VV.AA. 1963. *Eiga Nenkan*. Tokyo: Jiji Tsūshinsha.
Weinrichter, Antonio. 2002. *Pantalla amarilla: el cine japonés*. Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Festival Internacional de Cine.
Yamamoto Kikuo. 1983. *Nihon Eiga ni okeru Gaikoku Eiga no Eikyō* [The Influence of Foreign Cinema on Japanese Cinema]. Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu.